

*Mr. V. Bandaiya* represented that the income now derived in the shape of school-fees was very small and if Government introduced the system of free education in all its stages, it would be a great boon to the country and many would be encouraged to prosecute higher education.

*The Dewan* replied that it was not possible to make education free in all grades.

*Mr. D. S. Hanumantha Rao* said that since the district boards of Bangalore and Chitaldrug agreed to the levy of the education cess, the same was levied, while it was not levied in the other six districts since the district boards of those districts did not consent to its levy. There was no justification for the Government to levy the cess in one particular place and leave off the rest. He prayed that the education cess now levied in Bangalore and Chitaldrug districts might be abolished or suspended till it was imposed throughout the whole State.

*Mr. Karnick Krishnamurthi Rao* supported the representation on the ground that as under the scheme of Constitutional Reforms, no new tax could be levied without the consent of the Assembly, the cess imposed in certain areas might be abolished, the question of its imposition being taken up in the re-constituted Assembly.

*The Inspector-General of Education* pointed out that the money that was derived would be utilised for educational purposes only in those two districts. It would be convenient for opening more schools, while the other districts which had not levied the education cess could not derive the same benefit.

*Mr. B. Sreenivasiengar* stated that in towns and villages where the population was only 2,000 or so, schools were freely opened, while in minor municipalities where the population ranged from 3,000 to 4,000, no such schools were opened. Unless this cess was uniformly levied, the people who had been paying this cess would not be satisfied. For instance, if the Anekal Municipality had remained a Union Panchayet, there would have been many advantages; no octroi would have been collected and it would not have been forced to pay the contribution for education which it paid now and it would be entitled to benefit from the district cess.

*The Dewan* replied that Government could not interfere with the powers of district boards and that the position of minor municipalities would, however, receive their consideration.

*Mr. G. Paramasivaiah* urged Government to delete the second clause of paragraph 5 of the Education Memorandum, dated 25th May 1921. He also requested Government to substitute the following in place of clause 5 of the same paragraph:—"consistently with the foregoing conditions, schools with an insufficient number of teachers not teaching up to a higher grade and those having unqualified teachers will have preference."

He thought it was very desirable to restore those schools which had deteriorated by taking them under Government management earlier than the others.

*The Inspector-General of Education* pointed out that one reason for some of the grant-in-aid schools not working

SUBJECT No. 125.

Making education free in all its stages.

*Mr. V. Bandaiya*, Nanjangud Taluk.

SUBJECT No. 126.

Abolition of the education cess.

Messrs. D. S. Hanumantha Rao, Devanahalli Taluk; T. Ramachandra Rao, Magadi Taluk; Rangaswami Chetty, Magadi Municipality; H. V. Chandrasekharaiya, Bangalore City Municipality; C. Naraharaiya, Nela-mangala Taluk; Anantharajappa, Ananthalakshminaranappa, Veerappa Gowda, Tumkur Taluk; and Abdul Nabi Khan Sahib, Tumkur Municipality.

SUBJECT No. 127.

(1) Certain changes in the Government Orders on the Education Memorandum.

Messrs. (1) G. Paramasivaiah, Lingayet Education Fund Association, Bangalore City; Munisami Gowda and Veeregowda, Doddaballapur Taluk.

satisfactorily was that the people were not interested in it. There could be no good of having schools in places where the people did not take interest in the education of their children. About 2,000 schools had to be closed on account of this reason. Wherever buildings were available, Government never lost the opportunity of opening a school, if they only knew that the necessity was urgent and that people were keen about having a school there.

*Mr. G. Paramasiviah* requested that the money that had been saved by the abolition of 2,000 schools might well be utilised for opening more schools in places where they were urgently needed.

*Mr. G. Paramasiviah* requested that a fixed grant might be allotted for primary education every year as for the University.

*The Dewan* replied that there were no funds for appreciably increasing the present grants for education.

*Mr. D. S. Mallappa* represented that Government had declared their policy with regard to education and it was their duty to carry out the promises made in this respect. Somehow money should be found for the purpose.

*Reply of Government.*—Noted.

(2) Setting apart every year a fixed allotment to work out the Education Memorandum.

*Mr. G. Paramasiviah*, Lingayet Education Fund Association, Bangalore.

(3) Giving effect to Government Orders on the Education Memorandum early.

Messrs. G. Paramasiviah, Lingayet Education Fund Association, Bangalore; D. S. Mallappa, Chickthimmegowda, Tiptur taluk; Thimmegowda and Gangappa, Nagamangala Taluk.

SUBJECT No. 128.

(1) Opening of Government schools where grant-in-aid schools are abolished.

Messrs. (a) D. S. Mallappa and Chikkarthimmai Gowda, Tiptur Taluk; (b) Anantharajappa, Anantha Lakshminaranappa, Veerappa Gowda, Tumkur Taluk and Abdul Nabi Khan Sahib, Tumkur Municipality.

(2) Retention of the grant-in-aid schools already opened.

Messrs. Maralusiddappa and H. Rudrapappa, Arsikere Taluk and M. Channabasappa, Arsikere Municipality.

*Summary of Discussion.*—(1) (a) The practice of collecting contribution for the establishment of grant-in-aid schools is discontinued. In places where such schools were abolished, Government schools may be started.

(b) Government schools may be started in places where the existing grant-in-aid schools were abolished.

*The Inspector-General of Education* explained that all these difficulties were due to financial stringency and it was not possible to find more money at the present moment. The savings effected by the abolition of the inefficient schools would be utilised for educational purposes alone.

*Summary of Discussion.*—(2) The grant-in-aid schools already opened may not be closed.

*Reply of Government.*—Noted.